

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments are respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 4-6 and 13 had been amended to provide a clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter and Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced. As such, claims 1-15 are currently presented for examination, no new claims have been added and no claims have been canceled.

#### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the language within claim 4 has been amended to more clearly describe Applicants claimed invention and for example, the recitation of “another user except said user” and “said mail address of said another user” have been amended to more clearly recite “a third party” and “said mail address of the third party”. Applicants believe that the amendments to claim 4 clearly obviate the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

#### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046247A1 to Iwase (hereinafter “Iwase”); and rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078159 to Petrogiannis et al. (hereinafter “Petrogiannis”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that in dramatic contrast to the claimed invention, none of the asserted references, whether taken alone or in combination, at least teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, for example, within claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a print service system comprising: *inter alia*, a user designation managing means for making a user id and a password for a mail address used by said user, and transmitting said user id and said password to said mail address. That is, as best understood, there is simply nothing in Iwase or Petrogiannis that remotely suggests the combination of a user designation managing means for making a user id and password for a mail system used by said user and transmitting said user id and said password to said mail address. Iwase instead discusses a conventional Groupware server system wherein the Groupware server system maybe used in connection with a personal computer or workstation, and in turn connected to a network. However the conventional Groupware server employs an open exchange of information and is described as an electronic bulletin board. See, Iwase for example, paragraph 44. Clearly, in Iwase there is no requirement for a user id or a password related to open exchange of information and access for an electronic bulletin board.

The Examiner goes on to allege that Iwase anticipates Applicants claimed use of a user id and password for a mail address used by said user. However, quite to the contrary of the claimed invention, Iwase discusses a user id and password merely being related to general access to and underlying registration in a supporting data base. See, Iwase for example, paragraph 0070. Similarly, with regard to independent claims 8-12, which also relate to a similar functionality as described above with regards to claim 1, and specifically where attached data is transmitted from a user and makes a user id and password required and particular to the individualized data message. Claims 8-12 are also not anticipated by Iwase.

Similarly, claims 2-3 which depend from independent claim 1 are also not anticipated by Iwase for at least the same reasons as discussed above, as well as the additional features recited therein. Accordingly the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 8-12 under section 102 to Iwase.

With regards to Petrogiannis, and for at least the similar reasons discussed above, Petrogiannis fails to anticipate Applicants' claimed invention with regards to claim 13. In fact, Petrogiannis in dramatic contrast to Applicants' claimed invention describes a system and method for approval of an electronic document over a network. In Petrogiannis, the system describes and requires a full corresponding application interface that must be deployed to a

corresponding user (the user being “a coordinate or a proponent”) before the system may operate. See, Petrogiannis for example, paragraph 0047. In addition, Petrogiannis requires an electronic “approval” which is one of two things; the corresponding proponent may electronically sign the document, by providing thereon any electronic element representing a signature, or verify the signature already exists on the document. See, Petrogiannis for example, paragraph 0049. None of these requirements are necessary to operate within Applicant’s claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 under U.S.C. § 102 to Petrogiannis.

### III. Claim Rejections under U.S.C. 103.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwase as applied to claim 1 above, and in further in view of Petrogiannis. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

For at least the same reasons and rationale discussed above, the combination of Iwase and Petrogiannis fails to render obvious each and every element of claims 4-6, 14 and 15. Specifically, when taken in combination, Iwase and Petrogiannis fail to provide what is lacking in either taken individually, and further fail to disclose each and every element of Applicants’ claimed invention.

Since claims 4-6 and 14-15 depend from claims 1 and 13 respectively, each claim 4-6 and 14-15 is distinguishable over the combination of Iwase and Petrogiannis for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regards to independent claims 1 and 13, as well as the additional features recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-6 and 14-15 under section 103 to Iwase in view of Petrogiannis.

### IV. Conclusion.


All matters having been addressed and in view of the forgoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiners reconsideration of this application and the immediately allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants' undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with this submission of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any overpayments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Dated: July 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

  
By Michael K. Mutter *WILLIAM TITON*  
Registration No.: 29,680  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant